Public Works
~~Marine~~ (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 216 I

DATED 1st March 99

2/3/99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Vyravanar Anicut

Revised Estimate of Rs. [illegible] for reconstructing and improving the —, Madura Dn., Sanctioned.

110/6

F.C.S.

2/3/99

Abstract sent to Indexer

[M. S. 300—23-8-97.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government {1899} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd.	1899.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 216 I., 1st March 1899.

MARCH.

Vyravanar Anicut

Revised estimate of Rs. 14,000 for reconstructing and improving the —, Madura division, sanctioned.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read—the following papers:—

From Lieutenant-Colonel O. V. BODDY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 8th July 1898, No. 924 M.D.

I have the honour to submit, for sanction of Government, a revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 14,000, for reconstructing and improving No. 50 Vyravanar anicut in the Periyakulam taluk of the Madura district. This estimate is submitted in supersession of that for Rs. 10,900 sanctioned in G.O., No. 444 I., dated 11th May 1897, the excess amount now requiring sanction being Rs. 3,100. In the comparative statement which accompanies the revised estimate, the cause for the increase or decrease under each item is fully explained. It will be seen that there has been no deviation from the sanctioned plan and estimate, the work having been carried out as designed, with the exception that a portion of the old body wall, which it was proposed to retain, not having been found sufficiently good, it has been dismantled and rebuilt.

2. Baling water proved a heavier operation than was anticipated; hence an excess under this item.

3. A lump sum provision of Rs. 500 was made in the estimate for the ring bund to turn water down the diversion. When Periyár water came down, this ring bund became much eroded and special measures had to be taken to strengthen it sufficiently to prevent a breach. The excess on this account is Rs. 1,449.

4. The right wing, which is on rather shallow foundations, had to be specially protected. Excess Rs. 50.

5. After execution of the work the diversion cut had to be bunded across to turn water down the channel. It was thought that this could be done from contingencies, but the Periyár water had so widened out the diversion cut, carrying away portions of the old flood bank, that closing of the diversion became a large item, and this, together with the protective works found necessary to prevent erosion, has caused an excess of Rs. 1,557.

6. A quantity of rough stone collected by the contractor was washed away by Periyár water; it was believed to have been stacked in a safe position, and a payment of Rs. 250 to the contractor for compensation is considered to be reasonable.

7. The abovementioned items form the principal cause of excess and could not have been fully foreseen when the original estimate was prepared.

To	the Superintending	Engineer,	VI	Circle,	dated	15th July 1898,		No.	VI./68 M.D.
To	„	„	VI	„	„	14th	„	„	69 M.D.
From	„	„	VI	„	„	27th Sept.	„	„	1302 M.D.
To	„	„	VI	„	„	3rd Oct	„	„	VI./92 M.D.
To	„	„	VI	„	„	7th Dec.	„	„	VI./119 M.D.
From	„	„	VI	„	„	24th Jan. 1899,		„	104 M.D.

No. 43 I.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, submits the accompanying revised estimate of Rs. 14,000 for reconstructing and improving No. 50 Vyravanar anicut in the Madura division, showing an excess of Rs. 3,100 over the estimate sanctioned in G.O., No. 444 I., dated 11th May 1897. The excess is attributed chiefly to the extra work involved by the action of the Periyár water on the diversion.

In the circumstances stated, the revised estimate is recommended for sanction.

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

26th February 1899.

ORDER—No. 216 I., dated 1st March 1899.

The following revised estimate is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs. 10,900 sanctioned in G.O., No. 444 I., dated 11th May 1897:—

Irrigation.
43. Minor Works and Navigation.
Minor Works for which neither Capital nor Revenue Accounts are kept, P.W.D.
Madura Division.
Original Works.
Reconstructing and Improving the Vyravanar Anicut (No. 50 of the list of Minor Works, P.W.D., Madura district, appended to G.O., No. 407 I., dated 6th July 1887).

	RS.
Estimate	14,000

2. This sanction is registered as No. 130 I. of 1898–99.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, with nine enclosures.
,, Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. W. D'Moss.

Public Works (1899) Department.

Print & issue concurrently

CURRENT No. 1833

From

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Order

No. 43 I

Dated 26-2-99.

Received } 1-3-99
Registered }

Enclosures ~~5~~ 16 (2 plans)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

No 50. Vyravanar Anicut. Revised estimate of Rs 14000. for reconstructing & improving — Note recommending for sanction the —

C.S.

BACK PAPERS.	
No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.	
No.	Date.

Hon'ble Mr Arundel

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Note recommending for sanction revised estimate of Rs 14000 for reconstructing and improving No 50 Vyravanar Anicut

UNDER date the

READ the following

...m the Supg: Engineer 6th Circle No 924 M. D. d/ 8th July 1898.

——— Do ——— No $\frac{II}{68 MD}$ d/ 15th —do—

——— Do ——— 69 M. D. d/ 14th —do—

...om ——— Do ——— No 1302 M.D. d/ 27th September 1898.

...o ——— Do ——— No $\frac{VI}{92 MD}$ d/ 3. Octr 1898.

... ——— Do ——— No $\frac{VI}{119 MD}$ d/ 7th December 1898.

...om ——— Do ——— No 104 M.D. d/ 24th January 1899.

No 43.I d/ 26.2.99

Print

Note

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Irrigation Asst

The Supg: Engineer, 6th Circle, submits the accompanying revised estimate of Rs 14000 for reconstructing and improving No 50 Vyravanar anicut in the Madura division, ~~involving~~ showing an excess of Rs 3100 over the estimate sanctioned in G.O. No 444. I. dated 11th May 1897. The excess is attributed chiefly to the extra ~~the~~ work involved ~~on the diversion channel~~ by the action of the Periyar water on the diversion. ~~The~~

3 Print

4P

Flag H

Print & issue immediately.

Please hurt papers to be printed

D.J.
1/3/99

1/3/99

In the circumstances stated the revised estimate is recommend-
-ed for sanction.

Order thereon. No-216 I d/ 1st March 99

AA 28.2.99

The following revised esti-
-mate is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs 10,900 sanctioned in G.O. No 444. I dated 11th May 1897:—

7 Ag. H

Irrigation.

43 Minor works and Navigation
Minor works for which neither Capital nor Revenue accounts are kept P.W.D.

Madura Division.

Original works.

Reconstructing and improving the Vyravanar anicut (No 50 of the list of minor works P.W.D., Madura district, appended to G.O. No 407. I d/ 6th July 1887.)

Estimate . . . . Rs 74,000.

This sanction is registered as No 130 I of 1898-99.

[signature]
24/2
99

WH
26.2.99

Done
7/4/3/99

To, The Chief Engineer for Irrigation
" Supg: Engr 6th Circle with 9 & enclosures.
" Examiner P.W. Accounts

B. I. Form No. 1—1,000—21-4-98.

[initials] 24/2/99
23.2.99. [illegible]

Public Works (189 8) Department.

CURRENT No. 80 MD

From The Supdg Engr. 6 Circle

Order

No. 924 MD

Dated 8' July 1898

Received 12 — do

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

No. 50 Vyyavavar anicut in the Periyakulam Taluq Madura Dt. Submits for sanction a revised Estm of Rs 14,000 for reconstg and improving —

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

No. 924 M.D.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,

~~Trichinopoly~~, 8th July 1898.
0/11

From Lt.Col. O. V. Boddy R.E.
~~The~~ Sperintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
~~for Irrigation~~

SIR,

4. ENCLOSURES.
1. Sanctd plan of anicut
1. do. Estimate
1. Revd Estimate
1. Comp. Statt.

I have the honor to submit for sanction of Government a revised estimate amounting to Rs 14,000 for reconstructing and improving No: 50. Vyravanar anicut in the Periyakulam Taluq of the Madura District. This estimate is submitted in supersession of that for Rs 10,900 sanctioned in G.O. No: 441 I dated 11 May 1897, the excess amount now requiring sanction being Rs 3,100. In the comparative statement which accompanies the revised estimate, the causes for the increase or decrease under each item is fully explained. It will be seen that there has been no deviation from the sanctioned plan and estimate, the work having been carried out as designed, with the exception that a portion of the

200—20-4-98

old body wall which it was proposed to retain, not having been found suffi-
-ciently good it has been dismantled and rebuilt.

2. Baling water proved a heavier ope-
-ration than was anticipated hence an excess under this item.

3. A Lump Sum provision of Rs 500 was made in the estimate for the ring bund to turn water down the diversion. When Periyar water came down, this ring bund became much eroded and special measures had to be taken to strengthen it sufficiently to prevent a breach. The excess on this account is Rs 1,449.

4 The Right wing which is on rather shallow foundations had to be specially protected. Excess Rs 50.

5 After execution of the work the diversion cut had to be bunded across to turn water down the channel. It was thought that this could be done from Contingencies, but the Periyar water had so widened out the diversion cut, carrying away por-
tions of the old flood bank, that closing

of the diversion became a large item, and this, together with the protective works found necessary to prevent erosion, has caused an excess of Rs 1557.

6. A quantity of Rough stone collected by the Contractor was washed away by Periyar water; it was believed to have been stacked in a safe position, and a payment of Rs 250 to the Contractor for compensation is considered to be reasonable.

7. The above mentioned items form the principal cause of excess, and could not have been fully foreseen when the original estimate was prepared.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant.

O. V. Bosley Lt. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer, IV Circle

P. W. D. 6th CIRCLE.

FROM

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

6TH CIRCLE.

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER,

NO.

Dated.
Received. } 189 .

Enclosure.

CHIEF ... FOR ...
12 JUL. 1898
No. 80 MCD

1833/98

58

Public Works (1898) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

VI

ISSUE No. 68 M.D

To

The Supg. Engineer, 5th Circle

(Reply to letter No. 924 M.D. dated 8 July/98.

Dated 15-7-98

Despatched 20-do-

Enclosures * 5

* Particulars of Enclosures.

1 Sanctioned plan of Anicut
1 — do — Estd
1 Revd Estd
1 Comp: Statt.
1 Petition with Eng. tr.

SUBJECT.

No 50. Vyravanar anicut in the Periyakulam Tq of the Madura Dt - Revised estimate of Rs1,400 for reconstructing and improving — States that before dealing with the — S.E. is requested to report on certain points & also to the cost, on the accompanying petition expressing a fear as to the strength of the work & returns the estd for reference

Indexed

E. I. Form No. 13—2,000—4-6-98.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R80 MD	8-7-98

Sent to Government with No. I.,
dated 189 .
Printed with G.O., No. I.,
dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
" 2 "
" 3 "
" 4 "
" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R111 MD	29-9-98
I 92 MD	3.10.98
R8 MD	24-1-99

VI

No 68 M.D. d/15-7-98

To
The S.E. VI.

With refce to the S.E.'s No 924 M.D. d. 8th July 1898 the U/s has the honour to remark that the excesses on the estimate seem to be chiefly due to the effects of the Panjar water which do not appear to have been properly provided for or anticipated.

2. The contractor it is thought might reasonably be expected to place his stone in a safe situation and it is not clear why Govert should pay for the results of his negligence.

3. Before dealing with the revised estimate the S.E. is requested to report on these points and also to the endorsement on the accompanying petition expressing a fear as to the strength of the work.

4. The estimate & enclosures are returned herewith for reference.

[illegible] 14/7/98

JCL 15/7
E.I.

ICU 1817

PWs.2
1833/55

Public Works (1898) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

VI

ISSUE No. 69 M.D.

To

The Supg. Engineer 6 Circle

Endst on petition
(~~Reply to letter~~ No. , dated 26/6/98.

Dated 14 - 7 - 98
Despatched 20 - 7 - 98
Enclosures *

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

Petition from V. N. Shanmukham Setti and others of Kilakkudulur & Melakkudulur in Periyakulam Tq. Madura Dt. — Forwards for report — and states that there is no ground for the fear expressed by the villagers and that the provision of the revised estimate just received in this office is sufficient in all respects.

Indexed

E. I. Form No 13—2,000—4-6-98.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
OWC 5675	7-7-98

Sent to Government with No. I., dated 189 .

Printed with G.O., No. I., dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
" 2 "
" 3 "
" 4 "
" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R111 Md	27-9-98
192 aug.	3-10-98
R 8 Md	24-1-99

PWC 5675
7-7-98

Petition No 304 dated 26-6-98 from E. S. Shaumahan Setti and others of Kilakkudulur and Melakkudulur Periyakulam Taluq Madura District stating that the Vayeravan anicut was constructed in their village on a wrong spot in spite of their protestations and which resulted in the anicut being washed away by the floods and pray that the sum sanctioned for earth repairs may be utilized in making the anicut stronger.

No 69 M.D. Dated 14-7-98.

Forwarded to the Supg Engr VI circle for report. It is hoped that there is no ground for the fear experienced by the villagers and that the provision of the revised estima[te] just received in this office is sufficient in all respects. As the work has already

failed once, no room for doubt
on this point should be left.

Sd/ J. C. Larminie
Ag Chief Engr
for Irrgn

14-7-98.

04.5.3
1833/55

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 111 M.D.

Order

From The Supg Engineer VI. Circle

No. 1302. L.D.

Dated 27th September 98

Received + Regd 28 Septr 98

Enclosures 7.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

No. 50. Vairavan Anicut. Forwards with further report the revised Estimate of Rs 14000 for re-constructing rimproving.

[illegible]

Ink 29/9/98

[illegible] 29/9/98

[illegible] 28/9

[illegible] 29/9/98

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
268 + 69 M.D.	July 98
R50 M.D.	8-7-98
R85 M.D.	23-7-98
I05 M.D.	11-10-97
I19 M.D.	13-2-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
I92 M.D.	8-10-98
R8 M.D.	24-1-99

No. 1302. I.D.

Supg Engineer's Office VI. Circle
Trichinopoly. 27th September 98
D/27.

From
Lt. Col. O. V. Boddy R.E.
Superintending Engineer
VI. Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation.

CHIEF ER
FOR I ON.
28 SEP 1898
No. 111 M.D.

Enclosures 7.

Sir,

With reference to your memorandum No. VI/68. I.D. dated 15th July 1898 returning for further report the revised estimate of Rs 14,000 for reconstructing and improving No. 50. Vairavan Anicut in Periyakulam taluq and in reference to Endt. No. VI/69 I.D. dated 14th idem, I have the honor to enclose a copy of the Dindigul Sub. Divisional Officer's No. J. dated 18th August 1898 bearing Executive Engineer's Endorsement No. 152. Ee. dated 26th August 1898, accompanied by a Survey of the river in the vicinity of the anicut on which is

s shown the work that has been carried out.

2. The Sub. Division Officer's report is so full that it seems hardly necessary for me to recapitulate what he has written. No damage has been done to the anicut. Some revetment below the Scouring Sluices has been washed away, due to the action of the water flowing through the Sluices & which has also disturbed a portion of the dry stone pitching which was laid for a width of 15 feet beyond the Apron. These damages will be made good.

3. The work has been carried out in accordance with the Sanctioned estimate, the chief causes for the excess of the revised over the Sanctioned estimate being the extra work involved by the action of the Periyar Water on the diversion. I think that it was impossible to have foreseen to what extent the diversion channel would have widened when Periyar water was let down. I inspected the work during construction and know the difficulties which had to be

Contended

contended with in keeping the Periyar water within limits.

4. The closing of the diversion was a difficult work. I think now that separate provision for closing it should have been made in the Estimate instead of leaving this work to be done from Contingencies, but such provision could not have been anything like what it really cost. The work was carried out in an out-of-the-way place and very feverish locality and closing the diversion had to be done against time.

I consider that the excess is due to causes which could not have been well foreseen.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

J. L. Nodley [?] Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer VI. Circle

26/7/98

Enclosures

Enclosures.

1. Sanctioned plan.
1. Sanctioned Est. of Rs 10900.
1. Revised Est. of Rs 14,000
1. Comparative Statement.
1. Survey Sketch.
1. Petition with Ex. E's Endt. Kumaon No. 61/69 P.D. D/ 14-7-98.
1. Copy of Supr. Engr's endt No. 152.E dated 26-8-98 on S.D.O's letter No. J D/ 18-8-98.

OWS.4 / 1833/84

78

Public Works (1898) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

ISSUE No. 92 MD / 11

To

The Supg Engineer 6 Circle

(Reply to letter No. 1302 MD dated 27 Septr 98

Dated 3.10.98

Despatched 8.10.98

Enclosures * 7

* Particulars of Enclosures.

1 Sanctioned plan
1 Sanctioned Estt for Rs. 10900
1 Revised Estt of Rs 14000
1 Comparative Stmt
1 Survey sketch
1 Petn with E Eng's [illegible] dated 6-9-98
1 Copy of SE's Endt No 152 E of 26-8-98 on SDO's letter No 3 of 18-8-98

SUBJECT.

No 30 Vairavan Anicut — Remarks on the revised estimate for the — and requests S.E. to have a survey &c prepared & forwarded to this office for a proper decision being arrived at with regard to rear left revetment.

I suppose the enclosures of R No 111 MD/98 are to be returned to the S.E. [illegible] 8/10/98

Returned to SE VI [illegible] 8/10/98

Indexed

E. I. Form No 13—2,000—4-6-98.

BACK PAPERS.		FURTHER PAPERS.	
No.	**Date.**	**No.**	**Date.**
R111 M.D	27-9-98	R 8 M.D	4-1-99

Sent to Government with No. I.,

dated 189 .

Printed with G.O., No. I.,

dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .

" 2 "

" 3 "

" 4 "

" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

Papers—

R111 M.D/98
I69 M.D/98
PWC 5675/98
I68 M.D/98
R80 M.D/98
R85 M.D/98
R118 M.D/97
I23 M.D/98
R27 M.D/98
I108 M.D/97
I109 M.D/97
IRS I1367 T/97
do R1282/97
do I735 T/97
do R853/97
do I602/97
do R587/97
I19 M.D/97
R18 M.D/97
G.O. 4440/97
G.O. 558 I/94
G.O. 559 I/93
G.O. 324 I/91

No. 92a Irr of 8-20-98

Letter No 1302, Irr of 27/3/98

from SE.

From the rough survey sketch accompanying this plan & from the plan of the anicut it seems by no means certain that the work is secure.

The alignment of the anicut with reference to the old sluice & discharge of the river is not good.

The whole set of the river is concentrated towards the Left.

There is nothing to show what the arrangement of banks in connection with the old sluice is.

The rear left revetment will require special treatment & to enable a proper decision to be come to, a large scale survey of the anicut (scale say $\frac{1}{300}$) should be made showing the river & new & old flood banks for some distance above the head of the latter.

2. Sections of the anicut, estima

to low river bed level for 100 feet below apron should be taken ~~to range of proposed water~~ efflux (?) as also two sections of the margin thro' left rear revetment & ~~again~~ also below it.

~~Two~~ Three or more sections (all cross sections to natural scale of 1/200) are required above the anicut showing the river bed, the new bank & the scoured diversion on the right, one of the sections to be at head of the diversion showing bed & bank levels.

The effects of flood water tearing down such a channel with a velocity due to over a 9 foot fall in so short a length, might very well have been foreseen.

It would also appear that the original protection measures were quite inadequate & have resulted in increased expenditure.

The proposed diversion of the river, by the S.D.O., to divert the set from the left margin would not probably have any effect. It would silt up again during the first freshe. Possibly a groyne as marked in red pencil might do some good.

— JCL
3/10/28

JB 6/10

6-15-5 1833/28

Public Works (1898) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

ISSUE No. 119 IV/C.M.B

To

The Supg Engineer 6 Circle

(Reply to letter No. , dated)

Dated 7. 12. 98

Despatched 10 12 98

Enclosures *

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

50. Viravan Anicut – SE requests with a remark to resubmit the plans and estimates for improving – returned to him in order that it may be seen whether some provisional orders at least cannot be given.

See R 85 Dn 8/98 for the rest of the file

Indexed

E. I. Form No 13—2,000—4-6-98.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Sent to Government with No. I.,
dated 189 .
Printed with G.O., No. I.,
dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
" 2 "
" 3 "
" 4 "
" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R 8 M D	24-1-99

Papers-

D 92 M D/98	D 602 T/97
R 111 M D/98	R 587/97
D 69 M D/98	D 19 M D/97
P.W.C. 5675/98	R 18 M D/97
D 68 M D/98	G.O. 444 D/97 (11-5-97)
R 80 M D/98	G.O. 558 D/94 (20-7-94)
R 85 M D/98	G.O. 559 D.d/19-6-93
D 109 M D/97	G.O. 324 D.d/10-4-91
R 118 M D/97	
D 23 M D/98	
R 27 M D/98	
D 108 M D/97	

M.S. Office D 1367 T/97
do — R 1282/97
do - D 735 T/97
do - R 853/97

$\frac{VI}{No 119 MB}$ d/7-12-98

S.E. VI.

This office No $\frac{VI}{92 MB}$
d/ ~~27 Sept~~ 30 Oct. 98.

As it is believed that the additional plans called for in the above cannot be completed before the end of March and by the time orders are passed on them the working season would be nearly over the S.E. is requested to resubmit the plans and estimates returned in order that it may be seen whether some provisional orders at least cannot be given. If there is any danger of injury to the scouring sluices it is hoped they are being kept closed whenever water in rear is less than a couple of feet depth on the sills.

7.12.98 W.H

JB 8/12

OW5.6
1533/81

C.E.I. 3-2-99

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 8 M.D.

Order

C.E.I.
Ansd. the ..

D.E.I.
26/1

From
The Supfg. Engineer.
V. Circle

No. 104. L. D.

Dated 24th January 1899.
Received } 26 — do —
Registered
Enclosures 5.
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

No. 50. Vepavan aniant. Resubmits with remarks the plans and revised Esti. of Rs 14,000 for reconstructing and improving — in Periyakulam taluq — Madura District.

C.E.I.
27/1/99 with 27/1/99

R 27-1-99

BACK PAPERS.	
No.	Date.
2119 m.d.	7-12-98
292 m.d.	3-10-98
219 m.d	13-2-97

FURTHER PAPERS.	
No.	Date.

No. 104 Ir. D.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,
Trichinopoly, 24th January 1899. D/25

From
Lt Col. O. V. Boddy R.E.
Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer,
for Irrigation

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
26 JAN. 1899
8 M.D

SIR,

5 ENCLOSURES.
1. Orig. Estimate
1. Revd Estimate
1. Plan of anicut
1. Survey of a portion of anicut
1. Comparative statement

With reference to your memorandum No: VI/119 M.D. dated 7 December 1898, I have the honor to resubmit the plans and revised estimate of Rs 14,000 for reconstructing and improving No: 50. Viravan anicut in Periyakulam taluq, Madura Dt, returned with your No: 92 M.D. of the 3d October 1898.

2. It is reported that there is no danger by the scour formed in rear of sand sluices and they will be closed when the water in the rear is less than two feet depth on the sills.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant

O. V. Boddy Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer, VI Circle

D/29 [illegible] 27/1/99

5-P